

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER
JUL 05 2006

REMARKS

Claims 1-9 have been objected to for various informalities.

Claims 1-2, 5, 7-8, 10-11, 17, 19, and 23 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,019,639 to Stilp ("Stilp") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,594,428 to Peterson ("Peterson").

Claim 22 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,529,230 to Chong ("Chong") in view of Peterson.

Claims 3-4 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stilp in view of Peterson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,114,918 to Astell ("Astell").

Claims 9, 24, and 25 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stilp, in view of Peterson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,825,280 to Merendini et al ("Merendini").

Claims 15, 16, 20, and 21 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stilp in view of Peterson, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,956,478 to Oyagi et al. ("Oyagi").

Claims 6 and 13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stilp in view of Peterson, and further in view of NPL (TOT Finder Decals).

Claims 12, 14, and 26 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Stilp in view of Peterson and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,222,455 to Kaiser ("Kaiser").

Claim 18 has been previously canceled.

Claims 1-17 and 19-26 remain pending.

Objection to claims 1-9

Claims 1 and 3 have been objected to for reciting the phrase "adapted to", which is allegedly not a positive limitation but only requires the ability to perform.

Claims 1 and 3 have been amended to recite "providing" rather than "adapted to provide", which is a positive limitation.

Applicants submit that this objection is now overcome.

Rejection of claims 1-2, 5, and 7-8 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claim 1, the Office Action states that Stilp teaches all of Applicants' recited elements except a receiver within the housing for receiving a wireless signal and a transmitter within the housing for transmitting a wireless signal to a receiver in the home security system to inform the home security system of a status of the safety light, and a transmitter responsive to the control for transmitting a wireless signal to the at least one safety light to activate the at least one safety light when the control receives the signal indicating that the emergency has been detected, which Peterson allegedly teaches.

Claim 1 has been amended to point out more clearly what Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claim 1 has been amended to recite, in part, a security system with a safety light feature including at least one safety light that includes at least one of a rescue alert light and a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit. Support for the claim amendment can be found, at least, in paragraph 0020 of the specification.

Stilp discloses a security network for a building using at least one RFID reader to communicate with at least one RFID transponder to provide the radio link between each of a number of openings and a control function capable of causing an alert in the event of an

intrusion. A gateway provides an interface between the security network and various external networks. The control function can be located in either or both of the RFID reader and the gateway. The RFID transponder is connected to an intrusion sensor. The gateway can communicate with the RFID reader using active RF communications, power-line communications protocol, or hardwire connection. The RFID transponder can contain an energy store. The RFID reader contains means for transferring power to an RFID transponder for the purpose of charging any energy store. The security network can contain more than one RFID reader.

The Examiner cites Fig. 25A of Stilp as teaching a safety light. Applicants submit that the cited reference has been misinterpreted. The lights taught by Stilp are for determining if a connection in the security system has been broken.

Column 33, lines 24-53 of Stilp read: "Another form of intrusion sensor may be implemented with light emitting diode (LED) generators and detectors. At least two forms of LED-based intrusion sensor are available. In the first form, shown in FIG. 25A, the LED generator and detector are incorporated into the fixed portion of the intrusion sensor that is typically mounted on the window or door frame. It is immaterial to the present invention whether a designer chooses to implement the LED generator and detector as two separate components or a single component. Then a reflective material, typically in the form of a tape, can be attached to the moving portion of the window or door. If the LED detector receives an expected reflection from the LED generator, then no alarm condition is present. If the LED detector receives a different reflection (such as from the paint of the window rather than the installed reflector) or no reflection from the LED generator, then an intrusion is likely being attempted. The reflective tape can have an interference pattern embedded into the material such

that the movement of the window or door causes the interference pattern to move past the LED generator and detector that are incorporated into the fixed portion of the intrusion sensor. In this case, the movement itself signals that an intrusion is likely being attempted without waiting further for the LED detector to receive a different reflection or no reflection from the LED generator. The speed of movement is not critical, as the data encoded into the interference pattern and not the data rate are important."

Column 34, lines 5-21 of Stilp read: "A second form of LED-based intrusion sensor is also available. In this form, the LED generator and LED detector are separated so as to provide a beam of light across an opening as shown in FIG. 25B. This beam of light will typically be invisible to the naked eye such that an intruder cannot easily see the presence of the beam of light. The LED detector will typically be associated with the LED-based intrusion sensor, and the LED generator will typically be located across the opening from the LED detector. In this form, the purpose of the LED-based intrusion sensor is not to detect the movement of the window or door, but rather to detect a breakage of the beam caused by the passage of the intruder through the beam."

Neither light configuration disclosed in Stilp teaches or suggests a safety light feature including at least one safety light that includes at least one of a rescue alert light and a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit, in contrast to Applicants' recited invention.

Peterson discloses a security system that includes a small hand held remote unit which allows a user to communicate with an inside receiver/transceiver. The inside receiver/transceiver is battery powered and operates in a low power draw standby state until activated to a higher power draw state by receipt of an activation signal from the small hand held remote unit. Signals from the small hand held remote pass through a light transmitting medium forming part of the

walls of the premise being protected. The inside receiver is positioned relative to the light transmitting medium to receive signals from the remote unit and produces a visible indication of the status of the system. This arrangement allows arming and disarming of the system from outside the area being protected.

The lights disclosed in Peterson are simple system status indicator lights. Column 4, line 64 to Column 5, line 13 of Peterson reads: "The inside receiver/transceiver, when operating in the full function state, effectively polls the control panel 10 and determines the system status. This information can be communicated (preferably visually) to the user through the transparent medium. The type of signal can be light emitting diodes, which could be red and green or yellow, to indicate armed, disarmed or an alarm condition has been reported, or any appropriate code, for example a single light could flash indicating that the system is armed or the light could remain steady if the system was disarmed. A quickly flashing pulse might be produced if the system had experienced an alarm condition. In this way, information is communicated to the user without gaining entry to the premise and without the alarm system producing a sensed condition that someone has entered the premise. The remote 60 also allows the user to activate or deactivate the system from the exterior of the premise, and thus, reduces the stress associated with the arming or disarming function."

Peterson does not teach or suggest a safety light feature including at least one safety light that includes at least one of a rescue alert light and a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit, in contrast to Applicants' recited invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Stilp and Peterson, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicants' amended independent claim 1 as each of these references fail at least to teach or suggest a

security system with a safety light feature including at least one safety light that includes at least one of a rescue alert light and a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit

Claims 2, 5, 7, and 8, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1 and are therefore patentably distinct over Stilp and Peterson for at least those reasons provided for claim 1.

Rejection of claims 10-11, 17, and 19, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claim 10, the Office Action states that Stilp teaches all of Applicants' recited elements except a receiver for receiving a wireless activation signal from a transmitter in a home security system when a sensor in the home security system has detected an emergency condition, a transmitter provided within the housing for transmitting a wireless signal to a receiver in the home security system to inform the home security system of a status of the safety light, and a control responsive to the receiver for providing an illuminated indicia on the first face for informing rescue personnel of the emergency condition when the wireless activation signal is received by the receiver, which Peterson allegedly teaches.

Claim 10 has been amended to point out more clearly what Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claim 10 has been amended to recite, in part, a safety light including at least one of a rescue alert light and a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit. Support for the claim amendment can be found, at least, in paragraph 0020 of the specification.

Stilp and Peterson have been discussed previously, and in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Stilp and Peterson, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicants' amended independent claim 10 as each of these references fail at least to teach or suggest a safety light including at least one of a rescue

alert light and a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit.

Claims 11, 17, and 19, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 10, incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 10 and are therefore patentably distinct over Stilp and Peterson for at least those reasons provided for claim 10.

Rejection of claim 22 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claim 22, the Office Action states that Chong teaches all of Applicants' recited elements except a transmitter provided within the housing for transmitting a wireless signal to a receiver in the home security system to inform the home security system of a status of the safety light, which Peterson allegedly teaches.

Claim 22 has been amended to point out more clearly what Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claim 10 has been amended to recite, in part, an illuminating safety light including at least one of a rescue alert light and a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit provided within the housing. Support for the claim amendment can be found, at least, in paragraph 0020 of the specification.

Chong discloses a remote surveillance and conferencing system that includes video transceivers and provides audiovisual communications over a standard Public Switched Telephone Network (PSTN). The system provides capabilities for closed circuit television (CCTV) applications, security systems, video conferencing, remote video surveillance, home automation, and fire control, without requiring a use of computer. Each video transceiver includes a dedicated keypad, which allows users to use the system without a telephone. Keypad controllers available to some of the video transceivers provide a capability to remotely control the system.

The Examiner cites Fig. 8, Fig. 9, col. 8, line 36 as teaching a safety light. Applicants submit that cited figures and passages do not teach the safety light recited in Applicants' amended claim.

The light disclosed in Chong at col. 8, line 36, and in Fig. 9 refers to a simple room light that is specifically that is controlled by a home automation feature. This light is not a rescue alert light or a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit, as recited in Applicants' amended claim.

The light disclosed in Fig. 8 of Chong is a simple strobe light. The strobe light is not associated with any particular location, does not provide an indication of the occupants of a room (such as children), and does not indicate a direction to an exit. Therefore, the strobe light taught by Chong is also not a rescue alert light or a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit, as recited in Applicants' amended claim.

Peterson has been discussed previously and does not teach or suggest Applicants' recited invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Chong and Peterson, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicants' amended independent claim 22 as each of these references fail at least to teach or suggest an illuminating safety light including at least one of a rescue alert light and a directional light for indicating a direction to an exit provided within the housing.

Rejection of claim 23 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claim 23, the Office Action states that Stilp teaches all of Applicants' recited elements except a receiver for receiving a wireless activation signal from a transmitter in

a home security system when a sensor in the home security system has detected an emergency condition, a transmitter provided within the housing for transmitting a wireless signal to a receiver in the home security system to inform the home security system of a status of the safety light, and a control responsive to the receiver for providing an illuminated directional indicia on the face when the wireless activation signal is received by the receiver, which Peterson allegedly teaches.

Claim 23 has been amended to point out more clearly what Applicants regard as the invention. Specifically, claim 23 has been amended to recite, in part, a directional safety light including at least one rescue alert light and at least one directional light for indicating a direction to an exit. Support for the claim amendment can be found, at least, in paragraph 0020 of the specification.

Stilp and Peterson have been discussed previously, and in view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that Stilp and Peterson, whether taken alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in Applicants' amended independent claim 23 as each of these references fail at least to teach or suggest a directional safety light including at least one rescue alert light and at least one directional light for indicating a direction to an exit.

Rejection of claims 3-4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claim 3, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose a plurality of sensors adapted to provide signals to the control indicating that the emergency condition has been detected, wherein the transmitter transmits a wireless signal to the at least one safety light to activate the at least one safety light

when the control receives the signal from any one of the fire detection sensors indicating that the emergency condition has been detected, which Astell allegedly discloses.

With respect to claim 4, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all of Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose a plurality of safety lights comprising respective receivers for receiving wireless signals, wherein the transmitter transmits wireless signals to the plurality of safety lights to activate the plurality of safety lights when the control receives the signal indicating that an emergency condition has been detected, which Astell allegedly discloses.

Stilp and Peterson have been discussed previously and do not teach or suggest the subject matter of Applicants' amended independent claim 1.

Further, because Stilp and Peterson do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claim 1, and because Astell does not teach or suggest the elements of claim 1 that Stilp and Peterson are missing, Astell is irrelevant.

Claims 3 and 4, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1, incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 1 and are therefore patentably distinct over Stilp, Peterson, and Astell for at least those reasons provided for claim 1.

Rejection of claims 9, 24, and 25 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claims 9 and 24, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all of Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose a directional light to indicate a direction of an exit from the building, which Merendini allegedly discloses.

With respect to claim 25, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all of Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose the control provides a plurality of illuminated

directional indicia on the face, one at a time, in a time sequence, to indicate a direction of an exit, which Merendini allegedly discloses.

Stilp and Peterson have been discussed previously and do not teach or suggest the subject matter of Applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 23.

Further, because Stilp and Peterson do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims 1 and 23, and because Merendini does not teach or suggest the elements of claims 1 and 23 that Stilp and Peterson are missing, Merendini is irrelevant.

Claims 9, 24, and 25, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 23, incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claim and are therefore patentably distinct over Stilp, Peterson, and Merendini for at least those reasons provided for claims 1 and 23.

Rejection of claims 15, 16, 20, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claims 15 and 20, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all of Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose a switch for detecting tampering with the housing, which Oyagi allegedly discloses.

With respect to claims 16 and 21, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all of Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose a switch for detecting that an installation of the housing has been compromised, which Oyagi allegedly discloses.

Stilp and Peterson have been discussed previously and do not teach or suggest the subject matter of Applicants' amended independent claim 10.

Further, because Stilp and Peterson do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claim 10, and because Oyagi does not teach or suggest the elements of claim 10 that Stilp and Peterson are missing, Oyagi is irrelevant.

Claims 15, 16, 20, and 21, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 10, incorporate all of the limitations of independent claim 10 and are therefore patentably distinct over Stilp, Peterson, and Oyagi for at least those reasons provided for claim 10.

Rejection of claims 6 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claims 6 and 13, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all of Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose an image of a fire fighter and a child, which NPL allegedly discloses.

Stilp and Peterson have been discussed previously and do not teach or suggest the subject matter of Applicants' amended independent claims 1 and 10.

Further, because Stilp and Peterson do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims 1 and 10, and because NPL does not teach or suggest the elements of claims 1 and 10 that Stilp and Peterson are missing, NPL is irrelevant.

Claims 6 and 13, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 1 and 10, incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims and are therefore patentably distinct over Stilp, Peterson, and NPL for at least those reasons provided for claim 1 and 10.

Rejection of claims 12, 14, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

With respect to claim 12, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all of Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose at least one light provided within the housing and responsive to the control for backlighting the first face to provide the illuminated indicia, which Kaiser allegedly discloses.

With respect to claim 14, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all of Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose the housing includes a second face, opposite the first face, and the control is responsive to the receiver for providing an illuminated indicia on the second face for informing rescue personnel of the emergency condition when the wireless activation signal is received by the receiver, which Kaiser allegedly discloses.

With respect to claim 26, the Office Action states that Stilp and Peterson disclose all of Applicants' recited elements but fail to disclose at least one light proved within the housing for backlighting the first face to provide the illuminated indicia, which Kaiser allegedly discloses.

Stilp and Peterson have been discussed previously and do not teach or suggest the subject matter of Applicants' amended independent claims 10 and 23.

Further, because Stilp and Peterson do not teach or suggest the subject matter recited in independent claims 10 and 23, and because Kaiser does not teach or suggest the elements of claims 10 and 23 that Stilp and Peterson are missing, Kaiser is irrelevant.

Claims 12, 14, and 26, which depend directly or indirectly from independent claims 10 and 23, incorporate all of the limitations of the corresponding independent claims and are therefore patentably distinct over Stilp, Peterson, and Kaiser for at least those reasons provided for claims 10 and 23.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration, withdrawal of all rejections, and allowance of all pending claims in due course.

Respectfully submitted,



Bradley M. Marazas
Reg. No. 51,997

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

PJE:BMM:me